# EXHIBIT 6
## PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

| | |
|---|---|
| **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION**<br><br>THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:<br><br>*In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD<br><br>*State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD | No. 3:21-md-02981-JD<br><br>**MERITS REPLY REPORT OF**<br><br>**HAL J. SINGER, PH.D.**<br><br>Judge: Hon. James Donato |

PARTY AND NON-PARTY HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Introduction and Summary of Conclusions ..... 5

Qualifications ..... 5

I. Dr. Leonard Fails to Undermine My Conclusions ..... 5

A. Dr. Leonard Fails to Undermine the Standard Economics and Rigorous Empirical Analysis That I Use to Establish Pass-Through ..... 6

1. Dr. Leonard Baselessly Rejects Standard Economic Methods Deriving Pass-Through From a Market-Wide Change in Costs ..... 8

2. Dr. Leonard Baselessly Rejects Standard Econometric Methods Demonstrating Developer Pass-Through of *Ad Valorem* Sales Taxes ..... 9

3. Dr. Leonard Baselessly Rejects Standard Economic Principles of Pass-Through ..... 10

4. Dr. Leonard's Empirical Estimates of Pass-Through Are Biased and Unreliable ..... 11

a. Dr. Leonard's "Real-World Examples" Do Not Reliably Estimate Pass-Through In the But-For World ..... 13

b. Dr. Leonard's "Synthetic Control" Regressions Do Not Reliably Estimate Pass-Through In the But-For World ..... 19

B. Dr. Leonard Fails to Undermine the Well-Established Economic Models and Methods That I Use to Estimate Take Rates in a More Competitive But-For World ..... 21

C. Dr. Leonard's Critiques of My Direct Consumer Discount Model Are Without Merit ..... 25

D. The Claims of Dr. Leonard and the Other Google Experts Regarding Markets In China Do Not Undermine my Conclusions ..... 26

E. Dr. Leonard's Remaining Critiques Are Without Merit ..... 28

II. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Undermine My Conclusions ..... 31

A. Dr. Gentzkow Does Not Demonstrate That Google Lacked Monopoly Power in the Relevant Antitrust Markets At Issue During the Class Period ..... 32

B. Dr. Gentzkow Fails To Demonstrate the Challenged Conduct Is Procompetitive 34

1. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that the Restrictions on Creating Even One Non-Google Version of Android in the AFA Are Procompetitive ... 35

2. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that the MADAs Are Procompetitive ..... 36

3. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that the Early RSAs Were Procompetitive ..... 40

4. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that the Later RSAs Were Procompetitive ..... 43

5. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that Project Hug Is Procompetitive . 44

6. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that Google's Unnecessary Technical Barriers Are Procompetitive ..... 46

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

7. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that Google's Developer Distribution Agreements Are Procompetitive ..... 47
8. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate that the Aftermarket Tie-In Is Procompetitive ..... 48
9. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate Other Challenged Conduct Is Procompetitive ..... 52
a. Project Banyan ..... 52
b. App Campaigns ..... 52
c. Project Alley-Oop ..... 53
C. Dr. Gentzkow Ignores Standard Antitrust Principles ..... 56
1. Dr. Gentzkow's Conclusion That "Competition Has Not Been Foreclosed" Does Not Follow From Standard Antitrust Principles ..... 56
2. Dr. Gentzkow Ignores the Coordinated Nature and Effects of the Challenged Conduct ..... 66
3. Dr. Gentzkow's "Fragmentation" Defense Is Without Merit ..... 67
4. Dr. Gentzkow Incorrectly Assumes That All Improvements in Output and Quality Are Attributable to the Challenged Conduct ..... 69
D. Dr. Gentzkow Fails to Demonstrate That Consumer Plaintiffs Have Not Suffered Antitrust Injury Resulting From Google's Anticompetitive Conduct, or that Consumer Plaintiffs "Would Likely Be Worse Off" Absent The Challenged Conduct ..... 71
III. Dr. Tucker Fails to Undermine My Conclusions ..... 72
A. Dr. Tucker's Proposed Megamarket Disregards Elementary Principles of Antitrust Economics ..... 75
1. A Relevant Antitrust Market Is Comprised of Substitutes, Not Complements ..... 75
2. A Relevant Antitrust Market Should Contain the Smallest Set of Substitutes Necessary To Exercise Market Power ..... 77
3. The Relevant Antitrust Market Is Defined Solely Based on Demand-Side Substitution ..... 78
4. Dr. Tucker's Proposed Megamarket Suffers from the Cellophane Fallacy ..... 78
B. Dr. Tucker's Critiques of My Market Definitions Are Without Merit ..... 79
1. The Market For Licensable Mobile Operating Systems Is A Relevant Antitrust Product Market ..... 79
2. The Android App Distribution Market Is Separate From the In-App Aftermarket ..... 84
3. The Android App Distribution Market Is A Relevant Antitrust Product Market ..... 86
4. The In-App Aftermarket Is A Relevant Antitrust Product Market ..... 89
5. Dr. Tucker's Claims On The Relevant Geographic Market Do Not Undermine My Conclusions ..... 90

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. Dr. Tucker's Report Fails To Show That Google Lacks Monopoly Power In The Relevant Markets At Issue ..... 90

IV. Dr. Skinner Fails to Undermine My Conclusions ..... 96

Conclusion ..... 97

Appendix 1: Materials Relied Upon ..... 98

Appendix 2: Dr. Leonard's "Real World Examples" Adjusted for Inflation ..... 105

Appendix 3: Linear Demand Does Not Fit the Data Well ..... 113

Appendix 4: Tax-Rate Regressions Collapsed Nationwide ..... 115

Appendix 5: Flaws In Google Experts' Take Rate Benchmarks ..... 116

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

**LAW FIRMS**
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

**FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

**E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.